

HOST-PLANT SPECTRUM OF STRAWBERRY SPIDER MITE¹²³D. J. Miller⁴, W. A. Connell⁵

ABSTRACT: Eighty six species or varieties of angiosperms from 30 families were evaluated for suitability as hosts for *Tetranychus turkestanii* Ugarov and Nikolski, the strawberry spider mite, and were rated as follows: 44.2% excellent, 16.3% acceptable, 8.1% poor and 31.4% unacceptable. The excellent hosts generally were concentrated in the upper middle portion of this subdivision of the plant kingdom, in the Rosaceae, Fabaceae, Malvaceae and their near relatives, but 2 of 4 Graminae and all 5 Cucurbitaceae tested also were excellent hosts.

DESCRIPTORS: Strawberry Spider Mite, Soybean Pests, Spider Mite Host Plants, *Tetranychus turkestanii* U. & N.

In Delaware during dry summers, the strawberry spider mite, *Tetranychus turkestanii* Ugarov and Nikolski, causes severe injury to soybeans (Simpson and Connell, 1973).

This study evaluates the suitability of a wide range of plants as hosts for *T. turkestanii*, and gives information on possible overwintering hosts as well as on hosts from which the mite could migrate to soybeans. Mellott and Connell (1965) reported *T. turkestanii* (under the synonym *T. atlanticus* McGregor) from 63 plant species, but said little about their suitability as hosts. Their list included plants reported as hosts in the literature which they were not able to confirm through collections.

¹Accepted for publication: December 5, 1973.

²Published as Miscellaneous Paper No. 664 with the approval of the Director of the Delaware Agricultural Experiment Station, Publication No. 423 of the Department of Entomology and Applied Ecology, University of Delaware, February, 1973. Part of a thesis submitted by the senior author in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Science degree.

³Acarina: Tetranychidae.

⁴Research Fellow (resigned June 30, 1972; now at Department of Entomology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich.).

⁵Associate Professor.

Materials and Methods--86 angiosperm species or varieties from 30 families were studied. Most of these were either potted with their root system intact in the field and transferred to the greenhouse or raised from seed. In the case of a few, which could not be transplanted easily, a leaf, or part of a leaf was evaluated on wet filter paper in a petri dish, a modification of Rodriguez' (1951) technique.

A soybean leaf infested with *T. turkestanii*, from a greenhouse colony, was placed on each plant or isolated leaf being tested. The mites which migrated from this material then were allowed to feed for 9 days. The life cycle of this mite is about 8 days at 21° C and 4 days at 27° C (Cagle, 1956). Our tests were conducted at 21° to 38° C so there was sufficient time for completion of at least one generation. At the end of the test period a few leaves were removed from each plant in the immediate area of introduction of the mites and eggs were counted, using a stereomicroscope, on the leaf on which they appeared most abundant. Egg production probably gives an indication of host suitability, since with spider mites there is a direct relation between food uptake and oviposition rate (Boudreaux, 1958).

Results and Discussion--The results of these tests are recorded in Table 1, where the plants are listed according to the classification of Britton and Brown (Gleason, 1963); Gray's Manual (Fernald, 1950) was the source of common names. The plants are rated, according to the number of *T. turkestanii* eggs per leaf, in 4 categories; 0 to 4 eggs - unacceptable; 5 to 24 - poor; 25 to 49 - suitable and 50 or more - excellent hosts. Overall, 60.5% appear to be excellent or suitable hosts and the remaining 39.5% poor or unacceptable. Included were 37 of the 63 species from which Mellott and Connell (1965) reported that this mite had been collected; of these, 21, or 57% were found to be excellent or suitable hosts.

Suitable to excellent hosts were found throughout this subdivision of the plant kingdom, but the greatest concentration was in the upper middle portion: the families Rosaceae to Asclepiadaceae. This includes the Fabaceae, or legumes, one of which is the soybean; the closely related Rosaceae; and Malvaceae, the family containing the economically important cotton plant. Sixty-six percent of 29 plants tested in this portion of the Angiospermae were excellent hosts and only 14% were unacceptable. This compares with 33% excellent hosts and 40% unacceptable among 57 plant species less closely related to the soybean. Notable among plant families not so closely related to the soybean, but containing excellent hosts, were two near opposite ends of the hierarchy, the monocotyledon family Graminae with two of four species excellent and the higher dictyocyledon family Cucurbitaceae with all five tested being excellent.

Admittedly, the methods used provide only a rough estimate of host suitability. Therefore the host list developed is only a tentative one. We did

not attempt a critical evaluation, since it is probably that fecundity in this spider mite is influenced by many things that we were in no position to control; air temperature and humidity at the leaf surface, fertility requirements of each plant species, age and conditions of prior exposure of plants, to mention a few. However, we believe the study provided a list of plants that we can now follow in nature to determine in what way they may contribute to maintenance of natural populations of *T. turkestanii*. We anticipate that natural hosts will be found only among those rated here as excellent, since we know that *T. turkestanii* has the ability, when it has no other choice, to maintain a population in the laboratory on plant species that we have never been able to associate it with in nature.

Suitability of selected plants as hosts of *T. turkestanii*.

Family and Species	Common Name	Rating ^a
GRAMINAE		
<i>Festuca rubra</i>	red fescue	-
<i>Lolium multiflorum</i>	Italian rye grass	-
<i>Sorghum vulgare</i> cv.	sorghum	+ + +
<i>Zea Mays</i>	corn	+ + +
LILIACEAE		
<i>Smilacina racemosa</i> ^b	false solomon's seal	-
MORACEAE		
<i>Morus alba</i> ^{b,c}	white mulberry	+ + +
URTICACEAE		
<i>Boehmeria cylindrica</i> ^{b,c}	bog hemp	+
POLYGONACEAE		
<i>Rumex crispus</i> ^{b,c}	yellow dock	+ +
CHENOPODIACEAE		
<i>Chenopodium album</i> ^b	lamb's quarters	+
<i>Beta vulgaris</i>	red beet	+ + +
AMARANTHACEAE		
<i>Amaranthus</i> sp. ^b	amaranth	+ + +
PHYTOLACCACEAE		
<i>Phytolacca americana</i> ^{b,c}	poke	+ + +
AIZOACEAE		
<i>Mollugo verticillata</i> ^b	carpetweed	-
CARYOPHYLLACEAE		
<i>Stellaria media</i>	chickweed	+ + +
<i>Dianthus Caryophyllus</i>	carnation	+ + +
RANUNCULACEAE		
<i>Thalictrum polygamum</i> ^{b,c}	tall meadow rue	+
LAURACEAE		
<i>Sassafras albidum</i> ^{b,c}	white sassafras	+
PAPAVERACEAE		
<i>Papaver</i> sp.	poppy	+ + +

CRUCIFERAE		
<i>Brassica oleracea botrytis</i>	cauliflower	-
<i>B. oleracea capitata</i>	cabbage	-
<i>Raphanus Raphanistrum</i> ^b	wild radish	+ +
<i>R. sativus</i>	radish	+ + +
<i>Lobularia maritima</i>	sweet alyssum	-
<i>Barbarea vulgaris</i>	yellow rocket	-
<i>Matthiola incana</i>	stock	-
ROSACEAE		
<i>Fragaria virginiana</i> ^b	strawberry	+ + +
<i>Potentilla norvegica</i> ^b	cinquefoil	+ + +
<i>P. recta</i> ^b	cinquefoil	+ + +
<i>Rubus</i> sp. ^{b, c}	blackberry	+ + +
FABACEAE		
<i>Trifolium pratense</i> ^b	red clover	+ + +
<i>T. repens</i> ^b	white clover	+ + +
<i>T. repens</i> cv.	Ladino clover	+ + +
<i>T. hybridum</i>	alsike clover	+ + +
<i>T. procumbens</i>	low hop-clover	+ + +
<i>Lespedeza intermedia</i> ^{b, c}		+ + +
<i>L. cuneata</i>	lespedeza	-
<i>Arachis hypogaea</i>	peanut	+ + +
<i>Lathyrus odoratus nanellus</i>	dwarf sweet pea	-
<i>Phaseolus limensis</i> ^b	lima bean	+ + +
<i>P. vulgaris</i> ^b	kidney bean	+ + +
<i>Pisum sativum</i>	garden pea	+ + +
<i>Glycine Max</i> ^b	soybean	+ + +
OXALIDACEAE		
<i>Oxalis stricta</i>	wood sorrel	-
<i>O. europaea cymosa</i> ^b	wood sorrel	-
EUPHORBIACEAE		
<i>Ricinus communis</i>	castor bean	+ + +
<i>Euphorbia maculata</i> ^b	eyebane	+
MALVACEAE		
<i>Althaea officinalis</i> ^c	marshmallow	+ + +
<i>A. rosea</i>	hollyhock	+ +
<i>Malva neglecta</i>	common mallow	+ + +
<i>Gossypium hirsutum</i>	cotton	+ + +
UMBELLIFERAE		
<i>Daucus Carota</i> ^b	Queen Anne's Lace	+ + +
<i>D. carota sativa</i>	carrot	+ +
APOCYNACEAE		
<i>Apocynum cannabinum</i> ^{b, c}	Indian hemp	+ +
ASCLEPIADACEAE		
<i>Asclepias syriaca</i> ^b	common milkweed	+ + +
CONVOLVULACEAE		
<i>Ipomoea hederacea</i> ^b	morning glory	-
<i>Convolvulus sepium</i>	hedge bindweed	+ + +
LABIATAE		
<i>Mentha spicata</i>	spearmint	-
SOLANACEAE		
<i>Solanum tuberosum</i>	potato	-
<i>S. carolinense</i> ^b	horse nettle	-

<i>S. Melongena</i>	eggplant	+ + +
<i>Lycopersicon esculentum</i>	tomato	-
<i>Nicotiana</i> sp.	nicotiana	-
<i>Petunia</i> sp.	petunia	-
<i>Capsicum frutescens grossum</i>	sweet pepper	-
SCROPHULARIACEAE		
<i>Verbascum Blattaria</i> ^b	moth mullein	-
<i>Veronica persica</i>	bird's eye	+ + +
PLANTAGINACEAE		
<i>Plantago lanceolata</i> ^b	buckhorn	+ +
CUCURBITACEAE		
<i>Cucurbita maxima</i>	butternut squash	+ + +
<i>C. Pepo</i>	pumpkin	+ + +
<i>C. Pepo Melopepo</i> ^b	summer squash	+ + +
<i>Cucumis Melo</i>	cantaloupe	+ + +
<i>C. sativus</i>	cucumber	+ + +
LOBELIACEAE		
<i>Lobelia inflata</i> ^b	Indian tobacco	+
COMPOSITAE		
<i>Zinnia elegans</i>	zinnia	-
<i>Cosmos</i> sp.	cosmos	+ +
<i>Ambrosia artemisiifolia</i> ^b	common ragweed	-
<i>Tagetes patula</i>	French marigold	+ +
<i>Heterotheca subaxillaris</i> ^b	camphorweed	-
<i>Erigeron annuus</i> ^b	daisy fleabane	-
<i>Aster</i> sp.	aster	+ +
<i>Centaurea Cyanus</i>	bachelor's button	+ +
<i>Taraxacum officinale</i> ^b	common dandelion	+ +
<i>Lactuca sativa crispa</i>	leaf lettuce	+ + +
<i>L. sativa capitata</i>	head lettuce	-
<i>Chichorium Intybus</i> ^b	common chicory	+
<i>Ageratum Houstonianum</i>	ageratum	+ +

- a. + + + excellent host, + + suitable host, + poor host, - unacceptable
 b. Hosts reported by Mellott and Connell (1965)
 c. Evaluated by detached leaf technique

REFERENCES CITED

- Boudreaux, H. B. 1958. The effect of relative humidity on egg-laying, hatching and survival in various spider mites. *J. Ins. Physiol.* 2:65-72.
- Cagle, L.R. 1956. Life history of the spider mite *Tetranychus atlanticus* McGregor, Virginia Agr. Exp. Sta. Tech. Bull. 124 : 1-22.
- Fernald, M. L. 1950. Gray's Manual of Botany. 8th ed. American Book Co., New York, N.Y. 1692p.
- Gleason, H. A. 1963. The New Britton and Brown Illustrated Flora of the Northeastern United States and Adjacent Canada. Revised. Hafner Publ. Co. for New York Bot. Garden, New York, N.Y. 3 vols.
- Mellott, J.L. and W.A. Connell. 1965. Notes on the life history of *Tetranychus atlanticus* (Acarina: Tetranychidae). *Ann. Entomol. Soc. Amer.* 58: 379-83.
- Rodriguez, J. G. 1951. Mineral nutrition of the two-spotted spider mites, *Tetranychus bimaculatus* Harvey. *Ann. Entomol. Soc. Amer.* 44:511-26.
- Simpson, K.W. and W.A. Connell. 1973. Mites on Soybeans: Moisture and Temperature Relations. *Envir. Entomol.* 2 : 319-323.